

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/645,006	08/21/2003	Hai H. Trieu	4002-2624	6126	
7590 10/05/2005			EXAMINER		
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP			PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E		
Bank One Cente	er/Tower	•			
Suite 3700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
111 Monument Circle,			3738		
Indianapolis, IN	N 46204-5137		DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application	No.	Applicant(s)		\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\			
Office Action Comments	10/645,006		TRIEU ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		, , <u>.</u>			
	Brian E. Pello	egrino _.	3738					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the c	over sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS R 1.136(a). In no event, riod will apply and will exattle, cause the applica	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be time cpire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONE	I. ely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•				
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	1 August 2003							
<u> </u>	This action is non	-final						
<u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
·— · · ·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
ologica in accordance with the practice and	or Exparto Quay	70, 1000 O.B. 11, 40						
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application	Claim(s) <u>1-100</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
	8) Claim(s) 1-100 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
	·							
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date			• •	O-152)				

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-28,85-91, drawn to an implant material, classified in class 424, subclass 422.
- II. Claims 29-56,92-100, drawn to a method of implanting a disc implant in disc nucleus, classified in class 623, subclass 17.16.
- III. Claims 57-84, drawn to plugging an intervertebral disc annulus hole with an implant, classified in class 606, subclass 213.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process that does not implant the material in intervertebral disc space, but could be used as an annulus for meniscal repair.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

Art Unit: 3738

process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process that does not plug a hole of intervertebral annulus, but is implanted between vertebrae within spinal prosthetic plates or a cage.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Specie I: Fig. 2. Specie XI: Figs. 29,30.

Specie II: Fig. 3. Specie XII: Figs. 31,32.

Specie III: Figs. 5-8. Specie XIII: Figs. 33,34.

Specie IV: Figs. 9-12. Specie XIV: Figs. 35,36,38.

Specie V: Figs. 13-15. Specie XV: Fig. 37.

Specie VI: Figs. 16-19. Specie XVI: Fig. 39.

Specie VII: Figs. 20-23. Specie XVII: Fig. 40.

Specie VIII: Figs. 24-26. Specie XVIII: Fig. 43.

Specie IX: Fig. 27. Specie XIX: Fig. 44.

Specie X: Fig. 28. Specie XX: Fig. 46.

Specie XXI: Fig. 47. Specie XXII: Fig. 51.

Specie XXIII: Fig. 52.

Art Unit: 3738

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Timothy Thomas on 9/30/05 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 3738

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian E. Pellegrino whose telephone number is 571-272-4756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30am-5pm) and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 6

TC 3700, AU 3738

BRIAN E. PELLEGRINO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Brian & Pellegrino